

REMARKS

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of March 30, 2004.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, based on the language “first flange” and “second flange”. Claim 1, upon which Claims 2 and 3 depend, has been amended to clarify that the “first flange” extends in a first direction from the [first or second] interlocking profile and that the “second flange” extends in a second direction from the [first or second] interlocking profile. The Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to Figure 3 wherein there is a flange (or flange portion) to the left of elements 12F, 12M and to the right of elements 12F, 12M for both elements 33 and 34. It is respectfully submitted that this resolves the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Yeager reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,823,933) in view of the Ouchi reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,068,585). The Yeager reference (see Figure 3) discloses the flange extending from only one direction from the interlocking profile, which is quite different from presently pending Claim 1 wherein, as discussed above.

The Ouchi reference discloses attaching zipper adjacent to one edge of a film, rather than a carrier web, in order to produce bags. This is a different process from attaching a zipper to a carrier web “to form a supply of carrier web with pre-positioned sections of zipper profile”.

The Ouchi reference discloses attaching continuous separated zipper sections, each separately, to a top and bottom film, and then joins the zipper. This is totally different from attaching interlocked discrete zipper sections to a carrier web.

Therefore, there is no basis, reason or teaching to combine the Ouchi reference with the Yeager reference.

Both the Yeager and Ouchi references are directed at totally different methods of attaching zipper to film, and even when combined will not result in the presently claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims are patentable over the cited references.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as herein are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Brown
Registration No. 32,200

Gerald Levy
Registration No. 24,419

Pitney Hardin LLP
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036-7311
(212) 297-5800